DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 823 LI 004 177

AUTHOR	Kirk, Thomas, Ed.; And Others
TITLE	Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction: Status Report 1972.
INSTITUTION	Association of Coll. and Research Libraries, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE	Feb 73
NOTE	75p.; (9 References)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Bibliographic Citations; College Libraries; *Library Education; *Library Instruction; Library Surveys; Library Technical Processes; Programed Instruction; Questionnaires; *University Libraries

ABSTRACT

Since January 1972 the Association of College and Research Libraries' Ad Hoc Committee on Bibliographic Instruction has been collecting information on bibliographic instruction programs in U.S. academic libraries. Included under this title are four reports which review some 174 completed questionnaires. The four reports cover: 1. Formal library courses with or without credit (excluding library science courses); 2. Formal library instruction as part of regular class activity; 3. Self-instruction (printed, audio-visual, and computerized); and 4. All miscellaneous types, and library orientation. Each review begins with a survey of the bibliographic instruction programs pertinent to the category of the review. Important long-standing programs are noted, and norms, or widely agreed-upon aspects of the particular form of instruction are discussed. Each review concludes with a table(s) which provides a brief description of each program reported. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 072823

Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction:

Status Report 1972

by

ACRL Committee on Bibliographic Instruction

Thomas Kirk, Chairman

Penny Abell

Hannalore Rader

Dennis Robison

Sara Lou Whildin

February, 1973

LI 004 177

ABSTRACT

Since January 1972 the Association of College and Research Libraries' Ad Hoc Committee on Bibliographic Instruction has been collecting information on bibliographic instruction programs in U. S. academic libraries. Included under this title are four reports which review some 174 completed questionnaires. The four reports cover: 1. Formal library courses with or without credit (excluding library science courses); 2. Formal library instruction as part of regular class activity; 3. Self-instruction (printed, audio-visual, and computerized); and 4. All miscellaneous types, and library orientation. Each review begins with a survey of the bibliographic instruction programs pertinent to the category of the review. Important long-standing programs are noted, and norms, or widely agreed-upon aspects of the particular form of instruction are discussed. Each review concludes with a table(s) which provides a brief description of each program reported.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE FORM USED

I. INSTITUTIONS OFFERING A FORMAL COURSE WITH OR WITHOUT CREDIT
by DENNIS ROBISON

II. COURSE-RELATED BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION by HANNALORE RADER

III. SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS by SARA LOU WHILDIN

IV. REPORT ON NON-FORMALIZED INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS by MILLICENT ABELL
and ANNE PASSARELLI

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS SUBMITTING QUESTIONNAIRES

EVALUATION FORM FOR THE USEFULNESS OF THESE REVIEWS

INTRODUCTION

At the ALA Conference in Dallas (1971), the Board of the Association of College and Research Libraries formed the Ad Hoc Committee on Bibliographic Instruction, to

> ...consider the possibility of establishing a clearinghouse for information on instructional programs currently in operation; to explore methods of evaluating existing programs and materials; and to investigate the need for research into problems connected with instructional programs.[1]

The Committee, at its Mid-Winter meeting (1972), agreed that a clearinghouse operation was important to librarians trying to establish new bibliographic instruction programs and discussed the possible forms such a clearinghouse should take. We rejected the idea of trying to collect and share the instructional materials being used in the instruction programs. While the printed material would not be too difficult to acquire and handle, the audio-visual materials would be a very expensive and time-consuming operation, one for which we saw little prospect of adequate funding. It was decided, therefore, to collect information about institutional programs through the use of a detailed questionnaire. This questionnaire was developed, submitted to a few librarians for comment and review, and then revised. The final form, shown after this Introduction, was sent to 225 librarians who had indicated an interest in bibliographic instruction by their attendance at one of the recently held meetings on the subject: the 1970 and 1971 Library Orientation Conferences at Eastern Michigan University, the 1971 ALA Preconference on the Undergraduate Environment, and the 1970 summer workshop/conference at Berkeley. In addition, notice of the launching of the Clearinghouse appeared in the news sections of several library journals and requests for the questionnaire were received as a result of those notices.

The 174 questionnaires, which were completed and returned by September 1, 1973, are the basis for the four reviews included in this publication. The four reviews are: 1. Formal library course with or without credit (excluding library science courses); 2. Formal library instruction as part of regular class activity; 3. Self-instruction (printed, audio-visual and computerized); 4. All miscellaneous types, and library orientation. Certainly the reviews are not all that a practicing librarian would need to enable her or him to develop a bibliographic instruction program. The reviews report only what is being done.

---

1. ALA Handbook of Organizations, 1971-1972 (Chicago: ALA, 1972), p. 36.

There is little evaluation because the Committee feels that the art (or science) of library instruction has not progressed far enough to even state precisely what bibliographic instruction should do, let alone evaluate whether the instruction has been successful. Evaluation is another aspect of the Committee's work which is now being pursued.

Each review begins with a survey of the bibliographic instruction programs that are included in the particular category. Important long-standing programs are noted and in some cases described briefly. The reviews also try to indicate norms or widely agreed upon aspects of the instructional programs. Each of the four reviews concludes with an appendix listing the institutions that completed the questionnaire, along with brief information about the individual programs, the availability of instructional materials from the institution, and the person or persons who can be contacted for further information. This publication concludes with a complete alphabetical listing of all institutions included in the reports. After each name appear two or more numbers. The first, in parentheses, is the number of pages in the institution's completed questionnaire (if more than five). The second and additional numbers indicate in which review or reviews that institution's program is reported.

The Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Bibliographic Instruction has a complete file of the questionnaires (a copy follows the Introduction) on which the reviews are based. The completed questionnaires are available for use by other librarians. Those marked with an asterisk in the listing at the conclusion of this publication are lengthy (more than five pages) because of the addition of extra pages and/or samples of printed bibliographic instruction materials. These questionnaires and samples will either be photocopied at the requester's expense or will be sent on loan for <u>one week</u>. All others are brief enough (less than five pages) that they will, upon request, be photocopied at the requester's expense. Request items by the identification number that precedes the institution's name in the list at the back of this publication. Please prepay all requests: 75¢ for each institutional report less than five pages long, and 10¢ per page for each report over four pages long. The number of pages is indicated in parentheses after the institution's name in the list at the end of this publication. Please send all requests to: Thomas Kirk
Box E-72
Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana 47374

The Committee would appreciate the completion of an evaluation of the questionnaire forms and these reviews. To that end a brief questionnaire is included at the

end of this publication. We would appreciate the completion and return of it to the above address.

For the ACRL Committee on
Bibliographic Instruction

Thomas Kirk, Chairman

Academic Library Instruction

ACRL's Ad Hoc Committee on Bibliographic Instruction Report Form

This form is intended to insure the exchange of information essential to identifying and developing academic library instruction programs. Please fill out the form as completely as possible; attach sheets with additional information necessary to adequately describe the program. Reporting libraries that have extensive programs should complete separate reports for each major component.

1. Date:

2. Name of reporting institution:

3. Name of program (to which one could refer to in correspondence):

4. Principal personnel involved in developing and executing program (include the names and positions of both library and non-library personnel):

5. Scope of program:

___A. Institution-wide program
___B. Program for one college, department, division, deiscipline, etc. Specify:
___C. Program for one course. Specify:
___D. Other. Specify:

6. Type of program:

___A. Formal library course with credit.
___B. Formal library course without credit.
___C. Formal instruction as part of regular class activities.
___D. Self-instruction program.
___E. Formal instruction not part of regular class activity. Specify:
___F. Other. Specify:

7. Participation in program is:

___A. Voluntary
___B. Mandatory

8. Site of instruction:

___A. At point of use in library.
___B. Classroom in library.
___C. Classroom outside library.
___D. Intended for use anywhere.
___E. Other. Specify:

9. Status of patron for which program intended:

___A. New students
___B. Undergraduate majors.
___C. Undergraduate non-majors.
___D. Graduates.
___E. Faculty.
___F. Any library patron.
___G. Special group (e.g., ethnic or racial minority, disadvantaged, high school or community group, etc.). Specify:
___H. Mixture of above or other. Specify: undergradutates, majors, graduate students.

10. Initial date of operation of the program (excluding planning):

11. Is the program continuing? ___yes ___no

12. How many times has the program been used? _____

13. How many patrons has the program reached since its inception (estimate if exact figures are not available):

14. How many patrons does the program reach in a single presentation (estimate if exact figures are not available):

15. What is the size of the population (as indicated in #9) that could be reached if the program were fully developed:

16. Any instructional materials used were:

___A. Texts and detailed syllabi (include samples of printed materials as appendix)
___B. Bibliographies and other short printed materials (include samples of printed materials as appendix)
___C. Slide-tape.
___D. Audio tape.
___E. Film.
___F. Film loops.
___G. Videotape.
___H. Other instructional material. Specify: transparencies, filmstrips, slides.

17. Indicate source and availability of materials checked in #16. If more than one category is checked in #16, use those letters in marking this question.

___A. Commercially produced. Specify manufacturer and cost:

___B. Locally produced. Specify production cost:

___C. Special equipment necessary. Specify:

___D. Availability to other libraries:
    ___1. not available
    ___2. available free of charge
    ___3. available for loan free of charge
    ___4. available for rent; specify:
    ___5. available for purchase; specify:

18. Describe briefly the conscious decisions made in the planning of this program. (Include any printed materials as appendix.)

19. Describe precisely, but briefly, the operation of the program. (Do not repeat information already given in questions 1-18.)

20. How has the program been evaluated? What were the results? (Include any printed materials as appendix.)

21. Name and address of person submitting report:

22. Name and address of person to be contacted for further information on the program (if different than no. 21):

Thank you. Send this report to: Thomas Kirk
Box E-72
Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana 47374

Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction

Status Report 1972:

I. Institutions Offering a Formal Course With or Without Credit

by

Dennis Robison
University of South Florida

ACRL AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION

Report of Institutions of Higher Education Offering a Formal Course With or Without Credit

Thirty-four of the institutions which returned the Committee's questionnaire responded that they offered a formal course teaching bibliographic instruction or library use. The majority orientated the course toward the undergraduate, the participation was voluntary and credit was earned. Six institutions provided a course, again for credit, which was subject related, e.g. introduction to the bibliographic literature of the Fine Arts. These courses, without exception, are required and are generally for the graduate student and/or upper division undergraduate in an honors program. Only two institutions reported offering a course without credit.

Historically, the formal course has been a part of the curriculum in some colleges and universities for many years. One institution reported it had given the course in one form or another for over fifty years. However, there appears to be a definite increase in recent years in the number of institutions developing library use courses. Of those reporting, only two had a course prior to 1960; six were begun between 1960 and 1970; ten began after 1970 and five are just beginning in 1972.

Why the renewed interest? It is common knowledge that student ignorance about library resources and how to get to them has been a continuous source of frustration to librarians. Many wrote they had tried several approaches to overcome this with little success. It became readily apparent that if adequate library instruction is going to be accomplished, librarians will have to do it. They felt that an integral part of any academic library's total outreach program is probably going to include some type of formal course. One definite factor causing an increase

in course offerings, particularly on the West Coast, stemmed from a conference on "Instruction in the Use of the College and University Library" held in 1970 at the Berkeley campus of the University of California.[1] This conference was influential in starting at least three of the reported projects which began after 1970.[2]

One often hears that offering courses of this nature is viable only at institutions having a small enrollment, that large universities and colleges could not begin to consider such a program. However, size appears not to be a factor. Of the twenty-eight libraries which offer courses, fifteen had an enrollment in excess of 5,000 students. Obviously all students cannot enroll in the course at one time. Several schools held their enrollment to 100 to 200 students per term, frequently offering several sections. At this rate, the year's total contact with students in the course would range from 300 (3 semesters X 100) to 800 (4 quarters X 200). If the instructional program is educationally valid, it would seem clear that a relatively large portion of the student population will have acquired the basic library skills needed for their academic careers.

Over 50% of those reporting had either formal (e.g. questionnaires at the end of the term) or informal evaluations made of the course. Several of these were standard evaluation forms given to all classes at that campus. In only one reported case, Beloit College, was there any mention of lack of enthusiasm about the results of the course. Some librarians were not satisfied with how they presented the material and were exploring different, and hopefully better ways, of teaching. In the vast majority of the reports there is a very positive attitude towards the course from both the librarians and students. A number of librarians

---

[1] Instruction in the Use of the College and University Library: Selected Conference Papers. California University, Berkeley, School of Librarianship. (ERIC ED 045 103)

[2] University of Alaska, University of Wisconsin (Marshfield), College of Marin

felt that the ability of the students and the quality of library service in general had markedly increased because of the course.

Developing and Implementing the Course

Pre-planning for the course generally takes from six months to a year. Quite often it is done by a committee of librarians, mostly from public service. This committee formulates the course objectives and content. In most cases, the objectives are quite simple, leading to creating an awareness of the basic reference tools, how they are used and where they are physically located. Objectives then point to content, e.g., the card catalog, periodical indexes and abstracts, encyclopedias, government documents, etc. In a few cases, some time will also be devoted to term paper formats and technical details such as footnoting and preparation of a bibliography. A few libraries reported field trips to other libraries in the immediate vicinity as part of their course.

Teaching of the course may be assigned to one or two librarians or team teaching by an entire department may be used. Both methods were reported with equal frequency. The latter was popular because it distributed the work load more evenly. Most librarians involved in teaching were not given additional time off to prepare for the course and were generally expected to continue to perform their regular duties. In nearly all reported cases, the librarians, and not the regular teaching faculty, taught the course. However, the course was rarely offered directly through the library but was sponsored by another academic department such as English, Humanities or by a College within the University. Open enrollment is common, requiring no prerequisites or class standing.

Students volunteer for the course and take it for credit, usually 2 hours per term. The syllabus and the text is written by the library staff in the majority of the institutions although some commercially available textbooks are used. The most popular of these is Jean K. Gates' Guide to the Use of Books and Libraries (McGraw-Hill, 2nd ed., 1969). Lectures and demonstrations of material are

supplemented by transparancies, slides and sample bibliographies. Generally, the media materials is made locally. Assignments are usually made in terms of a bibliographic search, resulting in a bibliography which, hopefully, demonstrates an ability to use a variety of library tools.

Written evaluation of the course is common and opinions of the students highly valued. Many librarians reported that they altered their course considerably after it was first offered due to constructive student criticism-changing emphasis, deleting portions of the content and adding new items. Rarely is a course dropped because of a lack of student enthusiasm or need. One library did report that severe budget cuts might have an adverse effect on the program.

Library Instruction at the University of Alaska

While the preceding is a description of most of the courses reported, one program offered by the University of Alaska is unique and worthy of special comment. After trying a variety of methods which met with little student response, the Rasmuson Library instituted in 1969-70 a one hour course on Library Reference Materials which was moderately successful. However, the students objected to the amount of work involved for so little credit. After she had returned from the Berkeley Conference, Millicent Hering, Head of Reader Services, recommended that this course be dropped as a formal classroom/lecture presentation and that a new course be instituted which would be self-instructed and self-paced. Called Lib. 101: Library Skills, the course was first developed at UCLA and presented at Berkeley by Miriam Dudley of the Undergraduate Library there. The University of Alaska adaptation is a series of 16 TASKS (one for each week of the semester) written by the Reader Services' staff. The TASKS consist of a self-guided tour of the basic reference materials formerly covered by lectures. Each task must be completed in sequence and has a short exercise demonstrating mastery of the area. After satisfactory completion, the student may then go on to the next TASK.

Grading and monitoring are supervised by the library staff assisted by retired teachers who also are stationed at a Security Desk. The students are encouraged to complete the course at their own speed but must complete all TASKS by the end of the term. They then receive 1 hour of credit. The SKILLS program is open to all students who wish to take it. At the end of the course, they "will have an 85 page syllabus on the use and resources of the Rasmuson Library..." [3] Lib. 101 is a prerequisite of Library Science 201: General Bibliography. This course represents the second phase of Alaska's library education program and concentrates on in-depth bibliographic searching, using Daniel Gore's text-workbook Bibliography for Beginners (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968). By requiring Lib. 101. the staff is relieved of educating students on simple library skills and can spend more time on subject bibliographies and more sophisticated reference materials. Students are advised to take the 201 class concurrent with one of their academic courses requiring a research paper.

How successful has Alaska's program been? Mrs. Hering reports that 354 students registered for the fall semester 1971, and 227 enrolled in the spring of 1973.[4] A recent memo indicates that 1972 fall semester enrollment has increased to 450. The average student completed the course in 8 weeks during last fall term and 5 weeks during the spring. The cost per student was $2.39 excluding staff time. It is easily deduced from the report that the library Reader Services'staff was extremely busy during the first two semesters the course was offered, and from all indications will be more so this year. Now that much of the ground work has been completed, it will be interesting to find out how successful this program remains in the future.

In summation, it is obvious that the library use course is highly prized by those who are involved in it. The reports manifest a feeling of professional satisfaction to those who teach it, colored perhaps by a silent prayer for more help and more time.

---

[3] Memorandum to University of Alaska Faculty, August, 1971
[4] Memorandum to H. Theodore Ryberg, Director of Libraries, June, 1972

Appendix A

DISCIPLINE-RELATED COURSES ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION:

Biology

California State University, San Francisco

One hour credit; required by some departments; designed around thesis. Contact: Ms Betty Hemill, Science and Technology Library, California State University, 1630 Holloway, San Francisco, Calif. 94132. Text and other material-commercially produced, available for purchase for $6.75 and .90. Bibliographies locally produced and not available to other libraries.

Fine Arts

Indiana University

Offered by Fine Arts Department, not library; for graduate students. Fall quarter only, average 10 students. Contact: Ms Betty Jo Irvine, Fine Arts Librarian, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. 47401. Text - commercially produced; Bibliographies locally produced and not available to other libraries

University of British Columbia

Emphasis on research and bibliographic methods, primarily for honors and graduate students, 3 hours credit. Contact: Ms Melva J. Dwyer, Fine Arts Division Library, University of British Columbia, Vancouver 8, B.C. Locally produced.

Library Employees

Purdue University

Program for instructing para-professional library employees; emphasis on science and technology; course is 12-14 weeks long. Contact: Ms Katherine Markee, Personnel Office, Purdue University Library, Lafayette, Ind. 47904. Locally produced

Nuclear Science Engineering

Purdue University

Offered under auspices of School of Engineering; undergraduate and graduate students; uses film produced by U.S. Department of Defense plus locally prepared text. Contact: Edwin D. Posey, Engineering Librarian, Purdue University Libraries, W. Lafayette, Ind. 47906. Film - commercially produced; bibliographies locally produced - not available to other libraries.

Veterinary Science

University of California, Davis

Graduate students, required; two thirds of course devoted to problem solving; emphasis on bio-medical literature. Contact: Ms Winifred Kistler, Health Sciences Library, University of California, Davis, CA. 95606. Locally produced; not available to other libraries.

GENERAL LIBRARY BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION COURSES FOR CREDIT:

Aurora College

Team teaching; seminar approach, voluntary, undergraduate. Contact: Ms Rayonia A. Bable, Aurora College, Aurora, Ill. 60507. Commercially produced film loop not available; printed material available free of charge.

Beloit College

One of the few negative reports; e.g., "Often not enough students enrolled to make program worthwhile." Undergraduate, voluntary. Contact: Mr. Clyde J. Peterman, Beloit College Libraries, Beloit, Wis. 53511. Materials not available to other libraries.

California State University, San Francisco

Teaching flexible - some team, some individual; 3 hours credit; started in 1970, noted improvement in general library service. Contact Ms Ann Ultman, Library Education Committee, California State University Library, San Francisco, CA. 94132. Locally produced; not available to other libraries at present time.

California State University, San Jose

Team teaching; average undergraduate enrollment 100/semester; offered through Librarianship Department but taught by library staff. Contact: Ms Pauline Hughes, Orientation Service Librarian, California State University, San Jose, CA. 94114

College of Marin

Started in 1970, undergraduate enrollment varies from 20-100/semester. Contact: Ms Ann Coder, College of Marin, Kentfield, Ga. 94104. Locally produced; special equipment needed: slide projector synchronized with tape recorder. Not available to other libraries.

Georgia Institute of Technology

Offered through Library's School of Information and Computer Science to undergraduates in science, engineering and mathematics. Contact: Ms Francis Kaiser, Department of Library Instruction, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga. 30332. Locally produced for loan free of charge; available for purchase at $3.55 - "The Literature of Science and Engineering"

Merritt College

Started in 1964; offered to undergraduates, average class 7-15; uses Wilson Co. Pamphlets for insturction; may be stopped due to severe budget cuts. Contact: Ms Ann K. Godfrey, Merritt College, 12500 Campus Dr., Oakland, CA. 94619. Locally produced. Syllabus available free of charge. Texts and guides available for purchase.

Mills College

Voluntary for undergraduate and graduate students; been in existance since 1921. Contact: Ms Flora Elizabeth Reynolds, Mills College Library, Oakland, CA. 94613.

Nassau Community College

Started 1966; voluntary, undergraduate; some attempt to tie into existing academic courses; use of field trips. Contact: Prof. Rita Morris, Library Specialist, Nassau Community College, Garden City, N. Y. 11530. Text - commercially produced. Slide tape and transparencies locally produced. Special equipment necessary: overhead projector. Available for loan free of charge.

Rochester Institute of Technology

Required course; use of video tape plus lectures. Contact: Ms Edna Peer, Rochester Institute of Technology, Wallace Memorial Library, 1 Lomb Drive, Rochester, N. Y. 14623. Video tape locally produced not available to other libraries.

Sonoma State College

Voluntary, started in 1970; offered through English Department but taught by librarians and open to all undergraduates. Contact: Ms Barbara Biebush, Reference Department, Sonoma State College Library, Rohnert Park CA 94928. Commercially produced.

Stanford University

Started in 1967; offered through undergraduate library; combination lecture/tutorial. Contact: Ms Judy Romines, Meyer Undergraduate Library, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305. Text and Bibliographies commercially produced. Film slides, transparencies, and Xerox materials locally produced. Slides, transparencies and Xerox materials not available. Film available for rent.

University of Alaska (see text)

Uses two courses - one self instruction (1 hr. credit), and one lecture (2 hr. credit). Contact: Ms Millicent B. Hering, Head Reader Services, Rasmuson Library, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska. 99701. Locally produced; special equipment necessary: Graphics Services and Xerox machine. Available for purchase - $5.00.

University of California at Los Angeles

For credit with regular class activities; self directed-self paced (University of Alaska's program modeled afther this); Orientation towards minority students; Contact: Ms Mimi Dudley, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

University of Connecticut

Started 1971, voluntary undergraduate; class limited to 20 students/ semester. Contact; Ms Ann Linda Polcari, Reference Department, University of Connecticut Library, Storrs, Conn. 06268. Texts commercially and locally produced. Bibliographies locally produced. Special equipment necessary - overhead projector. Text and bibliographies and overhead projector not available. Text available free of charge.

University of Oregon

Voluntary, undergraduate, offers one section each winter and spring and two sections in fall. Contact: Ms Jane B. Durnell, Reference Library, University of Oregon Library, Storrs, Conn. 06268. Locally produced, not available to other libraries.

University of Wisconsin, Marshfield-Wood County

Started in 1971, voluntary, undergraduate; term project part of paper for other courses. Contact: Ms Georgiane Bentzler, University of Wisconsin Center, Marshfield-Wood County Campus, 2000 W. 5th St., Marshfield, Wisc. 54449. Locally produced.

Utica College

Started in 1970, not offered again until 1973; voluntary, average enrollment 45. Contact: Mr. Harry Tarlin, Director, Utica College Library Utica, N. Y. 13502

Virginia Military Institute

Broad discipline orientation - library procedures in humanities, in natural sciences, in social sciences; some voluntary, some required. Contact: Lt. Col. George B. Davis, Librarian, Preston Library, Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va. 24450

Wadhams Hall Seminary

Started 1967. Required of freshman; Contact: Rev. Richard S. Sturtz, Wadham Hall, Ogdenburg, N. Y. 18669. Texts commercially produced. Special equipment necessary: Projectors. Not available to other libraries.

Western College

Started Jan., 1972; fairly short (4 weeks) course, voluntary, uses team teaching. Contact: Ms Betty Wasson, Librarian, Western College Library, Oxford, Ohio. 45056. Texts commercially produced.

GENERAL LIBRARY BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION COURSES WITHOUT CREDIT:

Cazenovia College

Started in 1971; small enrollment, no evaluation of course but will have one in future. Contact: Ms Dorothea B. Shultes, Users Services Librarian, Cazenovia College, Cazenovia, N. Y. 13035. Bibliographies locally produced, Available free of charge.

Simon Fraser University

Consists of 3 lectures and 2 search sessions; not a full course; divided into five subject areas. Contact: Mr. Larry Thomas, Asst. Librarian for Collections, Simon Fraser University Library, Burnaby 2, British Columbia. Locally produced; special equipment necessary: Audio equipment. Not available to other libraries.

GENERAL LIBRARY BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION COURSES - FUTURE:

Austin College

To be offered in 1973 under auspices of Social Sciences Department; open to all undergraduates; will develop own textbook. Contact: Mr. Gene Gibson, Hopkins Library, Austin College, Austin, Texas. 75090. Materials not available to other libraries.

California State University, Northridge

Fairly elaborate plan to instruct within various desciplines through subject specialist librarians. Contact: Ms Helen Bennett, Reference Librarian, California State University, Northridge, CA 91324. Locally produced. Special equipment necessary - cassette equip. Not available to other libraries.

California State University, San Diego

To begin in 1972; offered through Humanities Department; will develop own text. Contact: Ms Beverly Johnson, Malcolm A. Love Library, California State University, San Diego, CA 92115. Locally produced, available for purchase.

Case Western Reserve University

Voluntary, undergraduate; started because other informal attempts generally unsuccessful. No starting date listed. Contact: Mr. Charles R. Andrews, Asst. Director/Public Services, Case Western Reserve University Library, Cleveland, Ohio. 44106.

Staten Island Community College

Experimental "mini" course of seven weeks for credit; voluntary, will use team teaching. Contact: Ms Phyllis Zucker, Staten Island Community College, 715 Ocean Terrace, Staten Island, N. Y. 10301. Texts commercially produced; Bibliographies and other short printed matter - locally produced. Available free of charge

University of St. Thomas

Will begin in Sept. 1972; required of all freshman; 1 hour credit. Contact: Rev. William J. Sheehan, CSB, Doherty Library, University of St. Thomas, 3812 Montrose, Houston, Texas 77006

University of South Florida

Starts fall quarter, 1972; locally prepared text; 2 hrs. credit; will use team teaching; anticipated enrollment of 200 students in five sections; offered under auspices of College of Language and Literature; open to all undergraduates. Contact: Mr. Dennis E. Robison, Asst. Director/ Public Services, University of South Florida Library, Tampa, Fla. 33620

Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction

Status Report 1972:

II. Course-Related Library Instruction

by

Hannalore Rader
Eastern Michigan University

ACRL Ad Hoc Committee On Bibliographic Instruction

Report on Course-Related Library Instruction

Orienting the users to the library and instructing them in basic bibliographic research methods has traditionally been part of the academic librarian's function. The problems connected with this aspect of library service are numerous and the library literature is filled with their exploration. It seems that no institution has yet found a perfect method with which to provide all its potential users with bibliographic instruction, though the attempts toward that goal are considerable.

A search of the library literature reveals a curious occurrence: Every second decade the problem of bibliographic instruction becomes of renewed interest to the profession and articles, conferences, workshops, committees, etc. focus on finding a better solution to this particular problem.

At the present such a period of renewed interest in library instruction in evident. Eighty of the one hundred and thirty five institutions of higher education which responded to the ACRL Ad Hoc Committee on Bibliographic Instruction questionnaire, reported that they offer course-related library instruction. Among them are public and private, large and small community colleges, four-year colleges and universities representing twenty seven states.

The common guidelines for orientation programs in these eighty institutions are that library tours are ineffective and should be given in slide-tape show form, and more importantly, bibliographic instruction is only effective when related to a class assignment. Consequently, these institutions are trying to provide their users with assignment-related bibliographic instruction through cooperation with the teaching faculty.[1]

[1] A majority of the programs are based on the library instruction programs at Earlham College and SIU at Edwardsville as stated within the questionnaires.

Thirty six of the reporting libraries are actively involved in obtaining faculty cooperation either through written communications (8%), or through personal contacts (36%) followed by cooperative instruction. Unfortunately, only one out of the eighty reporting institutions gives details about how to develop faculty cooperation successfully by offering a faculty workshop (Rosary College).

The majority of the reported orientation programs began in the late 1960's or early 1970's (74%), the University of North Carolina started as early as 1940, Brooklyn College began in 1946[2], Northeastern University began in 1967 and eight others started in the mid 1960's.

59% of the reported programs are intended to orient all levels of users from freshmen to special students. 15% direct their program toward the freshmen only while 16% limit their bibliographic instruction to one subject area only such as English composition. Only one of the institutions limits its program to one sepcial group, Roosevelt University in Illinois has a program for foreigners, adults and high school students from the College of Continuing Education, the English Language Program and the Upward Bound. The remaining institutions aim their programs at either graduate or undergraduate students.

39% of the reporting institutions require participation in their programs, 46% have voluntary participation and in 15% some phases of the program are required while others are not.

89% of the programs are presented within the library, 40% of the 89% can also present their programs in other areas of the campus. The programs which are presented within the library are either at the point of use or in a classroom within the library building.

2 They include an interesting letter about how effective their program had been in the past, but it was reduced enough to be almost ineffective because of cuts in the budget and in personnel.

Though the reported figures are sketchy and unclear, it seems that few of the programs are able to reach their complete intended audience. 1% seems to reach them all, and these are usually the smaller institutions. However, this item on the questionnaire needs clarification and more information before any valid and conclusive comparisons can be made.

In 43% of the institutions major responsibiblity for library instruction is given to one person. In 1% of all the institutions a special position has been created for a person to organize and execute an instructional program on a full time basis. Such a person is either called orientation, instruction or outreach librarian. Only 1/2% of the institutions reported as many as seven persons involved in library instruction. From the program descriptions included within the questionnaires and other appended materials it is evident, however, that most of the institutions involve more of their librarians than they reported officially.

A variety of instructional materials are utitlized in the reported instructional programs: Bibliographies and bibliographical guides (85%), Transparencies (25%), Slide-Tape (17%), Films (5%), Videotape (2.5%), Handbooks (6%). Worksheets seem to be used by many of them but again the reports are not exact on this item.

More than half of the reporting institutions (57.5%) indicated that all or part of their instructional programs are available to other libraries. Some of these (42.5%) are available without charge, the remaining could be purchased. It is interesting to note that only five institutions are using commercially produced instructional materials, the rest of them produce their own.

Formal evaluations of a program has only been documented by Brigham Young University and partially by Northeastern University in Massachussetts. The other reports indicate that informal evaluations are more common such as questionnaires for faculty and students, surveys, user studies and interviews.

58 % of the institutions have done one or more parts of these evaluations, sometimes even several. Many of them included their forms and summaries. However, the responses indicate that most of the institutions are looking for better methods of evaluating their programs. More scientific and objective evaluations need to be developed.

There is increased concern among academic librarians to become involved in the instructional phase of their institutions by offering their services in the areas of research methods and bibliographic instructions. Academic librarians are less content with staying in the library and waiting for potential users, but instead, they are anxious to contact their users and demonstrate the library's usefulness to them.

All of the reports show that the programs are revised and updated continously. The consensus indicates that a variety of methods, materials and approaches is more successful than one type of instruction. Therefore, most institutions have a slide-tape or audio tour of the library in addition to their course-related bibliographic instruction program. The latter is most often based on worksheets for a term project.

Among the eighty programs are few exceptional e.g. very successful programs. Of course, Earlham and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville are noted for their excellent programs and have often been reported. Columbia University has provided a very detailed and thorough report of the library instruction program there. This could aid anyone contemplating a program of library instruction. Doane College in Nebraska also has included in the questionnaire a program outline and publicity calendar for bibliographic instruction in their library. The University of South Carolina Library has based the bibliographic instruction program on the one at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. They have included their worksheet, bibliographic guides and evaluation questionnaire.

This survey of course-related library instruction indicates quite clearly that most academic librarians would benefit from a common set of guidelines for bibliographic instruction.

SURVEY OF COURSE-RELATED LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

INSTITUTION	PERIOD	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	CONTACT PERSON
Andrews U. Berrien Springs,Mi	1962-	Ue	R	L	5T	--	1	--	SFT	I	C	Leonard Hill
Bank Street Col. New York	1972-	G	V	L	30	--	1	P	B	--	--	Michele Urvater
Baylor U. Waco,Texas	--	A	R	L	--	--	1	--	B	--	C	Jean F. Tolbert
Brigham Youn U. Provo, Utah	1971-	A	R	L	5T	4T	1	--	P	F	C Ch	Marvin Wiggins
Brooklyn College New York	1946-	A	R	L	50T	31T	1	W	S	I	Ch	Harold D. Jones
Butler U. Indianopolis, Ind	1971-	U	R	O	75	700	1	P	BT	--	F	Diana Swenson
California State U., Long Beach	--	A	RV	L	5T	--	3	--	B	--	F	Richard L. King
California State U., North Ridge	--	A	V	L	5T	15T	--	--	B S-T	I	N	Helen Bennett
California State U., San Francisco	--	A	--	L	--	--	--	--	BW	--	N	Ann Uthman
Carleton Col. Minn.	1971-	U	V	O	150	900	2	--	BT	--	F	Richard E. Miller
Catonsville Comm. Col., Md.	1968-	Fe	V	L	4T	--	1	P	B S-T	--	F	Ellen B. Fletcher
Cazenovia Col. New York	1971-	U	V	L	75	250	1	--	B	--	F	Dorothea B. Shultes
Centenary Col. for Women, N.J.	1969-	Fe	R	L	1T	--	2	--	S	--	F	Ruth E. Scarborough

SURVEY OF COURSE-RELATED LIBRARY INSTRUCTION CONT.

	INSTITUTION	PERIOD	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	CONTACT PERSON
	Clarkson Col. of Technology, N.Y.	--	A	R	LO	250	2.5T	3	PW	B	I	F	Ottilie Pollins
	College of Marin California	1970-	U	V	LO	5T	5T	2	--	B S-T	I	F	Ann Coder
	College of St. Thomas, Minn.	1972-	U	V	LO	--	--	4	W	BS	--	F	Scott Wright
	College of the Redwoods, Calif.	1969-	Ue	R	LO	420	--	2	P	B S-T	I	C	Marlys Maher
X	Columbia U., New York	1971-	U	V	O	400	--	7	P	B	I	F	Judith Herschman
	Cornell U., New York	--	F	V	L	--	--	2	P	B	--	F	Joan Ormondroyd
X	Doane College Nebraska	1971-	A	VR	LO	300	--	1s	W	B S-T	--	N	Paul T. Adalian, Jr.
X	Earlham College Richmond, Ind.	1965-	A	V	LO	2.25T	2.5T	4	P	BVT	I	Ch	James Kennedy
	Eastern Michigan U., Ypsilanti	1970-	A	V	LO	6T	--	2s	P	BT	I	Ch	Hannelore B. Rader
	Findlay Col., Ohio	1971-	A	V	LO	733	1.1T	1s	W	B S-T	I	N	Jean L. Sears
	Georgia Institute of Technology	1971-	A	V	LO	--	--	1s	W	BS	I	Ch	Frances E. Kaiser
	Grinnell Col, Iowa	1969-	A	V	LO	400	1.3T	3	--	BSW	I	F	Maru G. Wyly
	Iowa Wesleyan Col.	1969-	A	V	L	650	700	2	--	BSV	I	F	Jana Fast

SURVEY OF COURSE-RELATED LIBRARY INSTRUCTION CONT.

INSTITUTION	PERIOD	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	CONTACT PERSON
Jefferson Comm. Col., N.Y.	1968-	F	R	L	650	100o/o	1	--	B	I	F	Carol Salverson
Lincoln U. Penn.	1971-	U	V	L	--	1.2T	7	--	BTF	--	--	Emery Wimbish, Jr.
Lock Haven State Col., Penn	1965-	Fe	--	--	--	--	3	P	B	--	N	Bruce E. Thomas
Manhattanville Col., N.Y.	1970-	F	--	--	450	90o/o	6	--	B	I	C	Stefania Koren
Mercy Hurst Col., Penn.	1971-	A	V	L	500	800	1	--	--	I	--	Joanne Cooper
Miami U., Ohio	1971-	U	R	L	500	--	2	--	BST	I	F	Marilyn Logue
Monroe Comm. Col., N.Y.	--	--	R	LO	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	Judith A. Byman.
Mt. Sinai School of Med., N.Y.	1972-	F	V	O	--	--	2	--	B	--	--	Alfred M. Brandon
Nassau Comm. Col., New York	1965-	A	R	L	30T	18T	2	W	BT	I	F	Dr. Leonard Grundt
New York City Comm. Col.	1968-	A	V	LO	17T	--	1s	--	BFT	I	F	Dorothy Simon
N.C. State U., Raleigh	1972-	A	VR	LO	--	--	3	P	B S-T	--	N	D.H. Hill
North Dakota State U.,	1968-	A	R	LO	2T	4T	2	--	B	--	F	Carol Koehmstedt
Northeastern U., Mass.	1957-	A	V	LO	10T	40T	1	--	B S-T	FI	F	Arline Willar

SURVEY OF COURSE-RELATED LIBRARY INSTRUCTION CONT.

INSTITUTION	PERIOD	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	CONTACT PERSON
Northern Ill. U., DeKalb, Ill.	1964-	A	V	LO	--	--	3	--	BF S-T	I	Ch	James D. Newburg
Ohio State U.	1964	G	V	L	--	--	1s	W	--	--	--	Ruth M. Erlandson
Ohio State U.	1969-	F	V	LO	--	9T	1	--	BT	--	N	Alice S. Clark
Our Lady of the Lake Col, Texas	1968-	A	VR	LO	2T	2T	2	P	B	--	N	Mrs. Dumont
Pacific Univ., Oregon	1969-	A	VR	LO	--	--	2	--	B S-T	--	Ch	Charles H. Kemp
Providence Col, R.I.	1969-	A	R	L	1.5T	3T	2	--	BT S-T	I	F	Joseph H. Doherty
Roosevelt U., Ill.	1971-	S	R	L	250	6T	1	--	B	I	--	Avery W. Williams
Rosary Co., Ill.	1971-	F	R	L	186	600	1	P[x]	BT	I	--	Eulalia Brown
Rosemont Col., Penn.	1970-	A	V	LO	400	1.25T	3	P	BT	--	--	Sister M.D. Lynch
Rutgers U., N.J.	1969-	A	V	L	2T	2.6T	7	P	B	I	N	Daisy S. Brightenback
St. Jospeh Col, Conn.	1970-	A	R	LO	400	800	3	P	B	I	N	Alice Angelo
Simon Fraser U., Canada	1966-	U	R	LO	--	--	1	--	B	I	N	Larry Thomas
Sir George Williams U., Canada	1969-	A	V	LO	3.5T	18T	2s	P	BSA S-T	I	F	Richard Dewey
Sonoma State Col, California	--	U	V	L	--	--	4	--	B	I	--	Barbara Biebusch
Southern Ill. U., Carbondale, Ill	--	A	VR	LO	--	--	--	--	B S-T	I	F	Clayton Higham

SURVEY OF COURSE-RELATED LIBRARY INSTRUCTION CONT.

	INSTITUTION	PERIOD	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	CONTACT PERSON
X	Southern Ill. U., Edwardsville,Ill	1965-	A	VR	O	18.3T	100o/o	1s	PW	BA S-T	T	--	Millicent Palmer
	S.U.N.Y Brockport, N.Y.	1971-	Ae	V	LO	2.7T	10T	5	P	BS	I	F	Margaret Rich
	S.U.N.Y. Oswego, N.Y.	1968-	Aed	RV	L	2T	4.5T	3	--	ATe S-T	I	F	Stephen Torok
	S.U.N.Y. Stonybrook, N.Y.	--	A	V	L	150	1T	1	--	T	--	N	Connie Koppelman
	S.U. College Geneseo, N.Y.	1970-	A	V	L	500	5T	3	--	S-T	I	N	William T. Lane
	S.U. College Oneonta, N.Y.	--	A	V	L	2.2T	4.5T	3	P	B	--	N	Margaret Umberger
	U of California Irvine	1969-	Abi	R	L	100	1.4T	2	--	BT	--	N	Vincent Caccese
	U of California Santa Barbara	1966-	JSG	R	L	--	--	1	W	B	--	N	Carol Gibbins
	U of Dallas, Texas	--	A	V	LO	600	1.2T	1	--	H	--	F	Sister Jo Marie
	U of Denver, Colo	1971-	A	V	O	1.25T	8T	1	P	B	I	F	Eda Mason
	U of Guelph Ont., Canada	1971	A	R	L	--	--	1	P	BA	I	N	Bernard Katz
	U of Houston, Texas	1969-	Asc	R	LO	890	9T	4	--	BS	I	F Ch	Ann Robertson
	U of Houston, Tex.	1969-	Aed	RV	LO	1.3T	5T	1	--	B	--	--	Frances Benham
	U of Ill., Chicago Circle	1972-	A	V	L	1.2T	--	1	WP	BT	--	F	Aline Fairbanks
	U of Mich, UGL Ann Arbor	1971-	U	R	L	--	--	1	--	W S-T	--	N	Sheila Berger

SURVEY OF COURSE-RELATED LIBRARY INSTRUCTION CONT.

	INSTITUTION	PERIOD	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	CONTACT PERSON
	U of Nebraska, Lincoln	1971-	U	V	LO	3.5T	16T	4	W	B S-T	I	F	John W. Heusman
	U of Nebraska Omaha	1971-	A	R	L	2.5T	11T	7	--	B S-T	--	N	Sara Lou Williams
	U of N.C. Greensboro	1940-	Ue	VR	L	--	--	1	--	BT	I	F	Nancy J. Clark
	U of N.C. Wilmington	--	U	VR	L	2.1T	2T	3	--	BS	I	N	Philip C. Smith
	U of San Francisco Calif.	1968-	A	R	LO	1.5T	--	2	--	BHT	I	N	Judith Wainwright
X	U of S.C. Columbia, S.C.	1971-	Fe	R	O	2.6T	100o/o	2	P	BHWS	I	F	Lynn S. Barron
	U of South Florida St. Petersburg	1970-	A	--	O	5.5T	25 o/o	--	W	B	I	N	Ray Anne Kibbey
	U of Tennessee Knoxville	1972-	F	R	L	2.2T	3.8T	--	--	BT	I	F	Mary F. Crawford
	U of the Pacific California	1968-	G	V	L	--	--	4	WP	B	--	F	Melodye Morrison
	U of the Pacific, California	1970-	A	V	L	--	--	4	WP	BHT	--	F	Melodye Morrison
	U of Wisconsin Parkside	1972-	Uhso	R	O	35	35	1	--	BS	--	N	David Streeter
	U of Wisconsin Parkside	1971-	U	R	O	180	4T	1	--	S	--	N	David Streeter
	Washtenaw Comm.Col., Ann Arbor, Mich	1971-	U	VR	LO	330	3T	2	--	S-T	I	N	Margaret M. Orr

SURVEY OF COURSE-RELATED LIBRARY INSTRUCTION CONT.

INSTITUTION	PERIOD	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	CONTACT PERSON
Winthrop Col., S.C.	1969-	Fe	R	L	2.5T	--	4	--	WTH	I	N Ch	Laurance Mitlin
Wright State U., Ohio	1971-	A	R	O	2.1T	--	1	11	BS	--	N	Lynn Chmelir

EXPLANATIONS

A - Intended audience such as Undergraduates, Graduates, All levels, Freshmen .....
A small letter following the capital letter signifies one subject, e.g.
Fe - freshmen in Egnlish course
Ued - udergraduates in education department
Gsc - graduate students in science course
Abi - all levels in the biology department
Uhso - undergraduates in history and socioloy
S - special users

B - Library instruction is Required or Voluntary

C - Locale of library instruction either in Library or Out of library

D - Number of audience reached by library instruction

E - Possible number of persons to be reached (in D and E -T- stands for thousand)

F - Number of librarians involved in library instruction

G - Publicity such as Written communcations with faculty or Personal contact by librarians

H - Instructional materials used such as Bibliographies, Slide-Tape, Videotape, Audiotape, Transparencies, Worksheets, Slides, Programmed texts, Handbooks, Texts, Film.

I - Evaluation e.g. Informal or Formal

J - Availability of Instructional materials e.g. Free, Charge, Commercially produced, Not available

-- - indicates no information provided

X - A particular program is noteworthy or has something special to offer.

Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction

Status Report 1972:

III. Self-Instructional Library Programs

by

Sara Lou Whildin
Penn State University

ACRL AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION

REPORT ON SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS

Reflecting general educational trends, librarians are exploring ways in which students can learn library skills independently. Over twenty institutions reported on their self-instructional programs to the ACRL Ad Hoc Committee on Bibliographic Instruction. The key elements of these reports are presented in the two charts accompanying this article; one summarizes the information on the ten programs involving only print materials, the other capsulizes the data on the fourteen programs using non-print materials. Both charts include the following information:

1. name of reporting institution.
2. date the report was submitted.
3. brief description of the program.
4. identification of the type of personnel involved in the program's development. (L= librarians, F = classroom faculty, I = instructional service personnel.)
5. availability of the program on its own campus.
6. availability of the program to other libraries.
7. sources of additional information (the name of the person to whom inquiries should be addressed, selected recent reports in the professional literature).

The charts represent programs in institutions of varying size and purposes, from community colleges to graduate and professional schools. Most of the programs were developed for the novice library patron, but some are for those with specialized subject interests. While almost all programs were intended

for voluntary use, a few are now being required by instructors in various courses; two are one credit independent study courses. Some of the most interesting information about these programs does not appear in the charts, either because it is difficult to tabulate or generally unavailable. This information falls into four categories: motivation, objectives, evaluation, and production costs.

Examining the first category, four observations seem to underlie the motivation behind all these efforts. First, there is a recognition that students learn best what, where, and when they need to know. Second, there is an acknowledgement that some students feel embarrassed about asking a "stupid" question. Third, there is a feeling that although large numbers of students must be reached, their present skills and needs are so diversified that large group instruction is generally ineffective. Finally, there is the problem of a shortage of qualified manhours to provide the individual instruction needed by many students.

In response to these observations, librarians are developing self-instruction tools which attempt to meet one or more of the following general objectives:

1. to provide an alternative means of learning for those who do not benefit from traditional means.

2. to provide instruction in a format that allows the student to select the information he wants to learn in recognition of his own skills and needs.

3. to provide instruction in a format that allows the student to select his own time, place and pace of learning.

4. to provide instruction at the point of need, where learning is most likely to occur.

5. to free staff time from repetitive instruction in basic library skills so that it can be better utilized in teaching more sophisticated skills.

The extent to which these objectives have been achieved is difficult to determine because very few institutions reported any formal evaluation of their programs. Most of the reports indicated there had been only informal feedback, i.e. "students seem enthusiastic" and "demand outstrips supply." A few institutions are attempting to structure this feedback so it can be effectively used for program justification, improvement, and expansion. North Dakota State, M.I.T., Colorado State, and the University of Denver have questionnaires which solicit student reaction (samples from the latter three are included in the Drexel Library Quarterly 8:342-355, July 1972). For the most part, these forms evaluate student attitudes toward self-instructional programs. Certainly, attitude, a key determinant in the success of any effort, is an important factor to be considered; however, it is not the only factor. Learning, actual change in behavior, is the crucial factor inherent in all the objectives outlined above, and the measurement of its occurrence the missing link in most evaluations.

Two institutions which have made notable progress in measuring student learning are Brigham Young University and Earlham College; both programs have been adequately described in professional literature (see charts) and will not be detailed here. Briefly, Brigham Young develops its evaluation tools immediately after determining its objectives; it then constructs and refines an instructional model to ensure a positive evaluation. If one agrees with both the skills to be

mastered and the test to determine mastery, the instruction is highly effective; if one does not agree, he is responsible for developing alternative objectives and tests. Taken on its own terms, in light of its own objectives, BYU's program seems highly successful. Certainly, it is one of a very few programs which has recognized and made strong efforts to meet its responsibility for evaluating its own effectiveness. For those who feel there is something incestuous about programmed learning; that performance in isolated exercise situations does not accurately reflect performance in actual library research experiences, Brigham Young's evaluation falls short of the ideal.

Earlham's guided exercise in searching the biological literature has been evaluated in terms of student performance in actual library research experience. Examination of student papers and bibliographies indicated that the self-guided exercise had been at least equally effective as traditional classroom instruction, with the advantages of self-scheduling, pacing, etc. Earlham's evaluation concerned the student's product, but not his process; i.e. the student developed an acceptable bibliography, but it is not certain that he used an efficient or desirable method of compiling it. The more serious problem associated with this method of evaluation is the expertise and time require to conduct it on a large scale.

Despite some problems with both the Brigham Young and Earlham evaluations, the two institutions have made substantial contributions toward determining instructional effectiveness. This is not to assert that their self-instructional programs have met with any more or less success than those of other institutions. Their successes and failures are better documented; and, therefore, serve as better foundations on which future instructional efforts can be developed and evaluated.

Instructional effectiveness must be the primary factor guiding future research and development plans for self-instructional tools. Intuition suggests but does not substantiate answers to important questions such as: Are audio tapes with notebooks or actual tools as effective as more costly slide-tape programs? Do the programs which are participatory (programmed texts and computer assisted instruction) produce better results than the more traditional presentational programs? Can a student really learn at a "point of use" which is likely to be a point of much activity and observation? The answers to such questions must be available if self-instructional programs are to deserve a share of limited financial resources.

Financial data is the other important information lacking about these programs. A few institutions reported equipment and materials costs but these figures are not very meaningul in isolation from the more significant data on personnel costs. It can be inferred from most of the reports that vast numbers of manhours were employed al all levels (clerical, faculty, instructional service, and librarian). None of these programs is old engough (most less than two years) to determine if the high initial investment can be amortized over the long run. Unfortunately, it may never be possible to determine the cost-benefit relationships because so few institutions seem to be recording all their costs. Since many institutions were motivated to develop self-instructional tools because of manpower shortages (financial problems), this apparent lack of cost data is curious. Perhaps it can be explained by noting that many of the reporting libraries are working with grant money, or other campus units which

are absorbing some of the costs. Nevertheless, it can never be anticipated that outside support will continue; and the planning of future budgets which must include such programs will be severely hampered by a paucity of financial data. Finally, it must be noted that self-instructional tools have great potential for marketing, exchanging, and cooperative use arrangements. To be workable, all such arrangements must prove profitable for all parties involved; and, if library cooperation is teaching us anything, it is that profit is always measured in dollars and cents.

Despite some information gaps, these reports are useful in that they identify several programs which were previously unmentioned in professional literature. They highlight objectives which are exciting, applications which are ingenious, and enthusiasm which is encouraging. Most significantly, they reflect an important trend in academic library development, a shift of emphasis from collections to users.

SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS USING PRINT MATERIALS

Institution and Date of Report	Description	Personnel	Availability On Campus	Availability To Libraries	Sources of Additional Information
Brigham Young University 5-31-72	Using the Library: the Card Catalog, a programmed text covering filing rules, Dewey numbers, cross references, author, title, subject cards, tracings and LC subject headings. Also available in tape format. Programs on book, periodical, newspaper indexes and government documents are being developed.	L,F,I	Used in sophomore English	$1.95 from BYU Press.	Marvin E. Wiggins 370 JRCL Brigham Young Univers Provo, Utah 84601 Utah Libraries 14:21- Spring 1971 Drexel Library Quarte 8:269-279, July 1972 College and Research Libraries 33:473-9, No
California State University at San Francisco 6-19-72	Biology 670: Individual Study in the Use of Biological Literature. A self-paced, guided exercise to introduce students to search methods, and the literature of biology, as well as scientific writing and citation techniques.	L, F	One credit independent study	Not available	Cynthia Hall California State Univ at San Francisco Science and Technolog Library 1630 Holloway San Francisco, Calif.
Earlham College 7-7-72	A bibliography and guided exercise for locating biological literature. Guided exercise covers card catalog, subject headings, encyclopedias, annual reviews, Biological Abstracts, Science Citation Index.	L	Used in a biology course	$1.25 from:	Tom Kirk Box E-72 Earlham College Libra Richmond, Indiana 4737 CRL 32:465-474, Nov. CUEBS News 7:6-10, Ju Drexel Library Quarte 277-298, July-Oct. 19

SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS USING PRINT MATERIALS - continued

Institution and Date of Report	Description	Personnel	Availability On Campus	Availability To Libraries	Sources of Additional Information
Grinnell College 8-25-72	Programmed text orienting student to the library building. Apparently it involves some instruction in basic library skills because it is used to identify students who have almost no library skills.	L	Distributed thru freshmen tutorial program	Free of charge as supply permits	Mary Gae Wyly, Associate Librarian Grinnell College Grinnell, Iowa 50112
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute 5-25-72	Mini-manuals, 3 hole punched handbooks, on the card catalog, science and technology references, contemporary literature references. Each contains typical handbook information.	L	Distributed throughout library	No information	Mrs. Orlyn B. LaBrake Assistant to Director Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Library Troy, New York 12151
SUNY at Buffalo 6-12-72	Programmed workbook for abstracting, extracting, indexing and writing terse conclusions (in prep.)	F	Used in course on indexing and abstracting	Not at this time.	Dr. Charles L. Bernier School of Information and Library Studies SUNY Buffalo, New York 1421
UCLA 4-4-72	Workbook of 20 assignments designed to teach basic library skills. Same descriptive material is in all books, but different questions are designed for each student.	L	Offered thru various courses tailored to their needs	$2.00 as UCLA Library Occasional Paper No. 17 from UCLA Library 405 Hilgard Ave. Los Angeles, Calif. 90024	Mimi Dudley 230 Powell Library Bui UCLA Los Angeles, Calif. 9 Advances in Librarians 3:83-106, 1972.

SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS USING PRINT MATERIALS - continued

Institution and Date of Report	Description	Personnel	Availability On Campus	Availability To Libraries	Sources of Additiona Information
University of Connecticut 6-14-72	Play the Library Game, a 6 page self-testing exercise which introduces the student to the card catalog, Readers' Guide, and the local serials holdings list.	L	Distributed to freshmen and throughout library	Not available	Ann Linda Polcair Reference Department Wilbur Cross Library University of Connec Storrs, Conn. 06268
University of Nebraska, Lincoln 8-7-72	Handbooks on library facilities, circulation policies, and the card catalog. Bibliographies on subject reference sources. "Self-help guides" giving step-by-step procedures on such problems as locating serials.	L	Distributed throughout library	No information	Dr. John W. Heussman Director of Librarie University of Nebras Lincoln, Neb. 68508
University of Alaska, Fairbanks 6/72	A workbook of 16 assignments designed to teach basic library skills. Based on UCLA's program (see above).	L	One credit independent study course	$5.00 from:	Mrs. Millicent B. He Head of Readers Ser Rasmuson Library University of Alaska Fairbanks, Alaska 9 For more detailed description see section of this doc on formal courses wi credit.

SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS USING NON-PRINT MATERIALS

Institution and Date of Report	Description	Personnel	Availability On Campus	Availability To Libraries	Sources of Additiona Information
Brigham Young University 5-31-72	Cassette tour of library, with posttest, 40 min. walking time, 20 min. tape time.	L,F,I	Used with freshmen English, loan to other patrons	$2.00 from Wiggins	See BYU listing unde print materials.
California State University at Northridge 7-12-72	Cassette tour of library, 25 mins.	L	Available for individual loan	Not available	John Bollier Reference Department California State Uni Northridge, Calif. 9
Colorado State University 5-29-72	Project AIMLO (Auto-Instructional Media for Library Orientation), two slide-tape programs on the card catalog and periodical indexes. One audiotape with notebook on the Monthly Catalog. Each 5-9 mins in length, recycle automatically; programs begin when user lifts a phone receiver. Other programs in preparation.	L,I	Available in self-contained, custom built units, at point of use in library	No information	Richard C. Stevens Reference Librarian Colorado State Unive Fort Collins, Colo.
M.I.T. 6-21-72	Model Library Program: 5 programs using sound w/ notebook, sound w/ slides, or sound w/ filmstrip on: author-title catalog, subject catalog, STAR, Science Citation Index, Engineering Index. Each 2-5 mins. in length. Others in preparation.	L	At point of use in self-contained, continuous loop use units	Free of charge loans, duplication allowed	Jeffrey J. Gardner Director Model Library Projec Project Intrex M.I.T. Room 10-400 77 Massachusetts Ave Cambridge, Mass. 021 Drexel Library Quart 8:281-286, July 1972

SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS USING NON-PRINT MATERIALS - continued

Institution and Date of Report	Description	Personnel	Availability On Campus	Availability To Libraries	Sources of Additional Information
Mankato State College 6-8-72	Audio-tapes, slide-tapes worksheets and maps for orientation. (Scope not indicated.)	L	In library at all times	For reproduction costs	Dale K. Carrison Director of Libraries Mankato State College Mankato, Minn. 56001
North Dakota State University 7-3-72	5 slide-tape programs: general introduction to library, card catalog, periodicals, Monthly Catalog, ERIC.	L, I	Used in classroom or library carrels	Except ERIC, can be purchased (no price given)	Michael M. Miller Instructional Service North Dakota State U Fargo, North Dakota
Ohio State University, Pharmacy Library 8-15-72	5 slide-tape programs: card catalog; current periodicals; reference books for beginning students; use of Chemical Abstracts, Index Medicus, International Pharmaceutical Abstracts; literature search methods for advanced students (in prep.). 10 mins each.	L, I	Used in classroom or library	Not at this time	Virginia B. Hall Pharmacy Library Ohio State University 500 W. 12th Ave. Columbus, Ohio 43210
Ohio State University, Undergraduate Library 6-22-72	Commercially produced tapes and filmstrips on basic tools available for student use. Locally produced slide-tapes also available (no details on content). Computer assisted instruction available on the use of the card catalog.	L	Used in classroom or library	Not available	Alice S. Clark Undergraduate Librar Ohio State Universit Columbus, Ohio 4321

SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS USING NON-PRINT MATERIALS - continued

Institution and Date of Report	Description	Personnel	Availability On Campus	Availability To Libraries	Sources of Additional Information
Oregon State University /72	3 slide-tape programs on: card catalog, periodical indexes, government documents.	L, I	Used in classroom or self-learning centers	No information	Margaret B. Guss Social Science and Humanities Reference I Oregon State University Library Corvallis, Ore. 97331
Plymouth State College 5-31-72.	A card catalog introduction using 10 min. tape with slides, card reproductions and transparent overlays. Audio-tapes with worksheets on: Readers'Guide, Social Science and Humanities Index, Education Index (2-4 mins each, in prep.).	L	Used in library	No information	Robert McDermand Public Services Librar Lamson Library Plymouth State College Plymout[illegible] Hampshir 03
Portland Community College 7-3-72	3 programmed texts with filmstrips and cassettes: card catalog, Readers' Guide, reference books.	L	Used in media center or counseling center	Not available	Richard E. Enger Portland Community Col Library 12000 S.W. 49th Ave. Portland, Ore. 97219
University of Denver 5-31-72	CAI provides 27 courses on basic reference tools, card catalog, indexes, how to find book reviews, biographies, how to research term papers, etc. Supplemented by cassette tapes and bibliographies on the literature and search strategy of specific fields (in prep.).	L	At CRT in reference room	Not at this time	Eda Mason Asst. Director for Pub Services University of Denver Libraries Denver, Colo. 80210 Am.Libs. 3:643-645, Ju 1972. Drexel Library Quarter 8:301-312, 345-346, J 1972.

SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS USING NON-PRINT MATERIALS - continued

Institution and Date of Report	Description	Personnel	Availability On Campus	Availabilty To Libraries	Sources of Additional Information
University of Guelph 7-11-72	Cassette tapes to reinforce classroom lectures on search strategy and reference tools (no details on content).	L	Used in classroom or library	Not at this time	Bernard Katz Head of Information a Orientation Divsions McLaughlin Library University of Guelph Guelph, Ontario Canada
Washtentau Community College 5-30-72	Slide-tape program covering card catalog, subject headings, and media available in library; with self-testing exercise and answer sheet.	L, I	Used in classroom or library	Not available	Margaret M. Orr Learning Resource Cen Washtentau Community C Ann Arbor, Mich. 4810

Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction

Status Report 1972:

IV. Non-Formalized Instruction Programs (Including Orientations)

by

Millicent Abell
and
Anne Passarelli
University of Washington, Seattle

ACRL AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION
REPORT ON NON-FORMALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS
(INCLUDING ORIENTATIONS)

Those instructional activities which are not associated with a formal curricular offering and not clearly definable as "self-instruction" are included in this report. There was a wide range of responses covering both orientation and instructional programs. A tabulation of the 44 questionnaire responses appears at the end of this report.

General library orientation programs were not originally envisioned by the committee as part of its area of inquiry[1]; however, the questionnaire responses indicate that many librarians view these programs as a basic and inseparable part of the instructional "package". Certainly, if the possible levels of library instruction are viewed as a continuum, it is difficult to draw a definite line of demarcation between "orientation" activities and those of a strictly instructional nature.

If, however, these levels are defined as separate strata, then general orientation to library buildings and facilities might be viewed as the first level of library instruction, distinctly different in kind from instruction in the use of particular tools (level 2) or particular types of searches (level 3) or, at the topmost level, instruction in the research apparatus of particular fields of knowledge[2]. At this point, it should be emphasized that this or any other breakdown of student need levels is really only an educated guess; the need for a careful and comprehensive survey of actual and potential student library use is an obvious and pressing one[3].

---

[1]Thomas Kirk et al, "Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries: New Developments," Drexel Library Quarterly, VIII (July, 1972), 357.

[2]A definition of nine levels, useful for developing a systematic approach to instruction, can be found in Bruce L. Paulson's Junior College Library Orientation Innovations, UCLA, 1968 (ED 019 058), pp. 20-21.

[3]A provocative discussion of this need and possible ways of meeting it will be found in Use, Mis-use and Non-use of Academic Libraries, Proceedings of the New York Library Association-College and University Libraries Section Spring Conference, May 1-2, 1970.

The point of division between level 1 programs and the higher levels becomes that point at which skills-development appears as an objective of the program.

Most of the questionnaire responses indicated an awareness of the basic difference between the strictly-orientation and primarily-instructional needs of students. As Melum discovered in her 1971 survey[4], orientation, especially freshman orientation, is still very much alive. Its medium is typically the library tour with or without a multi-media presentation. Its goals are to inform students of the physical layout and general facilities of the library. Occasionally, though, a third goal appears in orientation planning: the idea that orientation should also present the library as a place of "good vibrations", where students can make contact on a personal level with sympathetic librarians. The University of Rochester provides one example of this approach - the 900 incoming freshmen were divided into groups of not over 15 students and each group assigned to a librarian who showed a film-tour of the library and then conducted a discussion session. Although the staff discovered some basic flaws in their plan, a major goal of the program "to establish good rapport between the students and library staff and to permit each student to become personally acquainted with at least one member of the professional staff" was apparently realized to an encouraging extent.

The Rochester example points up a recurrent problem in planning both orientation and instruction programs: population size. In large institutions, it is impossible to achieve the small-group personalized approach with an entire new matriculating class which may number several thousand. Rochester's major difficulty in implementing its program arose from the scheduling logistics involved in grouping 900 students with 32 librarians. It is worth noting that they took advantage of the entire library staff for this program. Applications of multi-media to orientation needs have, obviously, great appeal and usefulness in such institutions. On the other hand, it is precisely in these institutions where students often have the

---

[4]Verna V. Melum, "1971 Survey of Library Orientation and Instruction Programs," Drexel Library Quarterly, VII (July-October, 1971), 225.

greatest need for more personal contact to combat a prevailing atmosphere of de-humanization.

Is there a best time for providing students with library orientation at this first level? According to the goals for this type of orientation, it should probably be offered early in a student's college career. Whether the traditional (and traditionally hectic) Freshman Orientation Week, which at many institutions precedes the opening of school, is the best time is debatable. However, problems of scheduling, as in Rochester's case, arise when the library's orientation program is deferred until the school year has begun. The self-guiding tour and continuously-operating slide-tape are two attempts to provide physical and facilities orientation in a format which can be conveniently fitted into students' schedules. As noted above, the element of personal contact with librarians is sacrificed in these situations.

As the accompanying table indicates, freshman and general orientation programs were reported 37 times on the questionnaire responses. Not all of these programs, however, confined themselves to beginning-level orientation. Some combined a general library introduction with basic instruction on the use of common library tools, and some included worksheets to be completed or basic-skills tests. Melum reported in 1971 that "library lessons are being given only when they can be tied directly to term paper assignments"[5]; the present survey reveals that this is not entirely the case. Again, the Rochester program offers a case in point: while its objective was basic library orientation, the sessions also included some subject-area instruction. In her evaluation of the program's implementation, Marcy Chambers of the reference staff stated, "subject orientation is much better left until later, when the student has actually begun serious work in his major field. If given too early, it is lost." Many of the reporting institutions paid lip service to one or both of Melum's conclusions regarding library instruction - that it must be provided at the time of need, and that it should be continuous in nature. Some of them then proceeded

---

[5]Ibid, p. 228.

to schedule such instruction at the beginning of the academic year, apparently sacrificing their assessment of student needs to the demands of their other work schedules.

The questionnaire responses which described programs other than "orientation" types contained a mixed bag of responses at various levels to student needs. Included were examples of problem-oriented reference appointments, "mini-courses" in subject bibliography, and the preparation of a variety of bibliographic guides. At the second level of library instruction -- explanation of specific reference tools -- the obvious suitability of self-help, point-of-use materials has been recognized by many institutions. This level is closely tied to the next higher level, at which strategies are considered, for knowing how to use a catalog or index must be accompanied by an understanding of when to use it. Some of the programs reported here suggest over-emphasis on the tools themselves without the assurance that students also know the conditions of their use. The "Reference Raps" program at Indiana's Undergraduate Library, offering extended and individualized reference service by appointment, provides an example of an approach designed to meet both tool-knowledge and strategy-knowledge needs at the time when they are perceived as needs by the student. A similar program is offered to graduate students by the Columbia University Libraries. Expectation that the demand for individual consultation might soon outstrip the ability to meet it may have caused some libraries to avoid this approach. However, Indiana, one of the largest universities in the country, had only 100 students using this program over the course of four semesters.

When instruction is not tied to a specific course and not continuously available, there must obviously be some additional motivating factor for students to avail themselves of the program. Examples of scheduled instruction of this type are primarily targeted at graduate students who presumably have already recognized a need-to-know more clearly than have undergraduates. Among those programs is that

at the University of California at Davis which offered a voluntary seminar on biomedical literature to graduate students in the School of Veterinary Medicine. Attendance was constant throughout the five two-hour sessions. The Physics Librarian at Purdue University also offers voluntary seminars for graduate students which are timed at the point when course work is completed and students are about to begin their research projects. The University of Rochester, R.P.I., the University of Illinois, and University of California (San Francisco campus) offered similar programs for graduate students in particular disciplines[6].

All of these programs which offer instruction independent of course work were developed on the initiative of librarians and have been continued because of the enthusiasm of student response. Faculty cooperation may or may not exist and, although valuable, does not seem to be an indispensable element in these direct librarian-student teaching relationships.

The study in depth of the bibliographic organization of materials in a particular subject area, either as an end in itself or as a means of making students familiar with some basic configurations of information access, represents the highest level of library instruction. This type of instruction is also more likely to appear at the graduate level. However, one program reported here appears to possess at least the potential for meeting this level of need for undergraduates. It is the Brown University Graduate Student Assistant Program which has been described elsewhere[7]. With some grant funding graduate students are trained in reference techniques and function at both individual-user and department levels in

---

[6]A report of a recent survey of graduate student instruction can be found in an article by Lloyd W. Griffin and Jack A. Clarke, "Orientation and Instruction of Graduate Students in the Use of the University Library: A Survey," College and Research Libraries, XXXIII (November, 1972), 467-472.

[7]Connie F. Evrard and Charles C. Waddington, "The Undergraduate Survey: Its Role in Changing Patterns of Reference Service," Drexel Library Quarterly, VII (July-October, 1971), 351-356.

this capacity. One of the program is estimated to have increased from nine per cent of the undergraduate students the first year to 22% the second year[8].

Some preliminary conclusions are suggested by the data received to date. First, as mentioned above, it is clear that conventional modes of freshman orientation -- the tour, the freshman-week group session -- are still much in evidence. Certain types of simple and cheap audio-visual aids, particularly the slide-tape and the cassette-tour, appear with regularity in the reports; others, including videotapes and film loops, occur less frequently[9]. Tours of various types are still in use, but many institutions appear to be converting to the self-guiding type. There are few novel approaches to library orientation and an almost complete lack of evaluative procedures or measurable standards. Those few libraries which attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs rely, with few exceptions, on informal student comment.

On the positive side, the analysis of responses indicates that it is possible to provide library instruction to meet student needs at a variety of levels, even without benefit of formal library courses or self-instructional programs. Within the confines of a limited staff and budget, academic libraries have devised some successful small-scale programs for beginning students, such as Rochester's freshman orientation program described earlier and a similar program of library workshops at Douglass College, and also for more specialized student needs as at Columbia, Indiana, and Purdue.

---

[8] Brown University Library, Graduate Reference Assistant Project; Year-end Report, May, 1972, p. 2.

[9] The preponderant mode displayed at the ALA Clinic on Using Media in Library Instruction (ALA Annual Conference, June 28-29, 1972, Chicago) was the conventional slide-tape orientation.

Anyone familiar with the literature and practice of library orientation and instruction must be struck by the waste in duplication of effort, cost of time, equipment, and materials, and uncertainty of results in the effort to meet unclear needs by unvalidated means. Some broad efforts with very large groups, such as self-guided tours or brief exposure to sympathetic librarians, probably are essential and relatively economical practices although expensive experimentation remains essential.

There is an urgent need for data which will indicate cost-effectiveness on all levels of instruction and which will contribute to the development of a systematic program. Rather than imitating a variety of practices prevalent in library instruction, librarians should consider introducing limited programs which could yield the essential data.

Millicent D. Abell
Anne B. Passarelli
University of Washington
January 1973

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

(Analysis of responses - next five pages)

Number of institutions responding - 37

Number of questionnaires received - 44

Number of programs identified - 47

Program categories:

- Freshman orientation - 13
- Freshman orientation with tour - 6
- Freshman orientation, course-related - 5
- Tour - 10
- General orientation - 3
- Reference consultation - 3
- Seminar - 7

Other information about programs:

- Target group primarily freshmen - 27
- Target group primarily graduate students - 6
- Target group disadvantaged students - 1
- No particular target group - 13
- Multiple-session program - 6
- Program mandatory for certain groups - 12
- Program using media - 20
- Program includes tour of some sort - 17
  - A-V tour guide - 5
  - Printed tour guide - 4

Size of group in single session of program:

- 40+ persons - 9
- 20-39 persons - 7
- 2-19 persons - 5
- One person - 11
- Group size not given - 5

Institutional Contacts for Further Information

Connie Evrard, Reference Librarian
Rockefeller Library
Brown University
Providence, R. I.

John Bollier
California State University Library
Northridge, Calif.

Mrs. Winifred Kistler, Public Service Librarian
or
Mr. Marjan Merala, Biomedical Librarian
Health Sciences Library
University of California
Davis, Calif.

Mimi Dudley
College Library
University of California
Los Angeles, Calif.

Mary P. Barr, Head, Readers' Services
University of California Library
San Francisco, Calif.

BettyW. McMahon
or
Barbara Silver
University of California Library
Santa Barbara, Calif.

Mrs. Ottilie H. Rollins, Head Librarian
Harriet Call Burnap Memorial Library
Clarkson College of Technology
Potsdam, N. Y.

Eugene P. Sheehy, Head. RFference Dept.
or
Eileen McIlvaine, Reference Librarian
Columbia University Library
New York, N. Y.

Mrs. June I. Hicks, Assistant Librarian, Reader and Education Services
Baker Library
Dartmouth College
Hanover, N. .H.

James E. Ward, Director
Crisman Memorial Library
David Lipscomb College
Nashville, Tenn.

Thelma H. Tate, Reference Librarian
Douglass College Library
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, N. J.

Institutional Contacts for Further Information - Continued

Rachel S. Martin, Reference Librarian
Furman University Library
Greenville, S. C.

Dorcas Watkins, Reference Librarian
General Motors Institute Library
Flint, Mich.

Bernard Katz, Head, Information and Orientation Division
McLaughlin Library
University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario

Ms. Chieko Tachibata, Director
Sinclair Library
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Lois Bebout, Head, Social Science and Humanities Division
University of Houston Library
Houston, Tex.

Joyce Werner, Associate Reference Librarian
or
Aline Fairbanks, Reference Head
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle Library
Chicago, Ill.

Susan Pfeister, Reference Librarian
Education and Social Science Library
University of Illinois
Urbana, Ill.

Mrs. Jean Taylor, Reference Librarian
Undergraduate Library
Indiana University
Bloomington, Ind.

Miss Jan Crenshaw, Librarian
Lon Morris College Library
Jacksonville, Tenn.

Martha Donahue, Head, Public Service
Mansfield State College Library
Mansfield, Pa.

Miss Virginia Phillips, Coordinator of Reference Services
McKeldrin Library
University of Maryland
College Park, Md.

Jess Mullen, Undergraduate Librarian
Ellis Library
University of Missouri
Columbia, Mo.

Institutional Contacts for Further Information - Continued

Michael M. Miller, Instructional Services
North Dakota State University Library
Fargo, N. D.

Gary B. Thompson, Reference Librarian
Heterick Memorial Library
Ohio Northern University
Ada, Ohio

Miss Barbara H. Phipps, Chairman, Library Science Dept.
Pacific Union College
Angwin, Calif.

Robert McDermand, Public Service Librarian
Lamson Library
Plymouth State College
Plymouth, N. H.

Ronald H. Powell, Public Services Librarian
Learning Resources Center
Prince George's Community College
Largo, Md.

Barbara Pinzelik, Head, General Services
Purdue University Library
West Lafayette, Ind.
also
Martha J. Bailey, Physics Librarian
Purdue University

Mrs. Orlyn B. LaBrake, Assistant to the Director
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Library
Troy, N. Y.

Miss Marcy Chambers, Reference Librarian
Rush Rhees Library
University of Rochester
Rochester, N. Y.

Larry Thomas, Assistant University Librarian for Collections
Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia

Elizabeth R. Bates, Librarian
Engineering Library
Stanford University
Stanford, Calif.

Claire T. Loranz, Reference Librarian
Wellesley College Library
Wellesley, Mass.

Caroline M. Lunnock, Librarian
West Suburban Hospital School of Nursing Library
Oak Park, Ill.

Harold Way, Reference Librarian
Waldo Library
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Mich.

David Streeter, Head, Reference Dept.
University of Wisconsin - Parkside
Kenosha, Wis.

Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

I. FRESHMAN ORIENTATION

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials *
UC - Santa Barbara	REBYSONT, General Tours	freshmen/new students	125-150 Orient. Week	Slide-tape, library guide 6
Clarkson College	Library Orientation	freshmen	unknown 1st Week	Sample indexes, etc. 2
David Lipscomb College	Library Orientation	freshmen	150 Begin. year	Slide-tape(17 minutes) 1
U. of Guelph	Freshman Orientation Instruction	freshmen	unknown Orient. Week	response not clear 1
U. of Illinois (Chicago Circle)	Library Orient. Program	freshmen	unknown Begin. year	slides 3
Pacific Union	Freshman Library Instruction	freshmen	200 Orient. Week	test 6
Plymouth State	Tape Slide Tours	freshmen	25-30 Sept.?	Slide-tape(17 Minutes) 1
Purdue U.	Freshman Orientation	freshmen/new students	to 500 Sept.?	Slide-tape, library guide 1

*For key to numbers see last page of charts

Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

I. FRESHMAN ORIENTATION (continued)

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
U. of Rochester	Freshman Orientation	freshmen	15 Orient. Week	Slide-tape, handbook, bibliographies, etc. 1
Simon Fraser	Educational Services	freshmen/new students	unknown	Slide-tape 1
Stanford U. (Engin.Library)	Student Orientation	freshmen	5-50 Begin. year	Slides 3
Wellesley	Freshman Library Orientation (Multiple-session)	freshmen	40 Begin. year	Slides, bibliographies, etc. 6 2
West Suburban Hospital School of Nursing	Library Orientation (Multiple-session)	freshmen	12 Begin. year	Bibliographies, etc. 5: $0.50+#20 stamped env

II. FRESHMAN ORIENTATION WITH TOUR

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
Dartmouth	Library Instruction	freshmen	60 Begin. year	Slide-sound unit 6
Douglass College (Rutgers University)	Library Workshops	freshmen	8-15 Begin. year	Printed materials 1

* For key to numbers see last page of charts

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

II. FRESHMAN ORIENTATION WITH TOUR

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
U. of Houston	General Library Orientation	freshmen	10-35 Begin. year	Videotape 4
Mansfield State College	Freshman Orientation	freshmen	30 Orient. Week	Slide-tape 1
U. of Missouri (Columbia)	Sound/Slide Orient. Program	freshmen/anyone	100 Begin. semester	Sound-slide unit, library handbook 5
U. of Wisconsin (Parkside)	New Student Orientation	freshmen/new students	25 (discontinued)	Bibliographies, etc. 1

III. FRESHMAN ORIENTATION COURSE-RELATED

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
Furman U.	Library Orientation	freshmen	20-30 1st 2 weeks (discontinued)	Printed materials 2
Lon Morris College	Library Orientation	freshmen	30	Workbook, text 3
Mansfield State College	Library Instruction for English Comp. Classes	freshmen	20 Mid-semester	Sample materials, bibliographies 1

*Key to numbers on last page of charts

Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

III. FRESHMAN ORIENTATION COURSE-RELATED (continued)

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
Ohio Northern U.	[departmental orientation]	freshmen/undergraduates	100 Begin. semester	Bibliographies, handbook, commercial filmstrips AV-3 Printed-2
Prince George's Comm. College	Self-Guided Library Orientation	freshmen	individual Each semester	Cassette-tape, worksheet 3

IV. TOUR

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
Calif. State (Northridge)	Cassette Tour	anyone	individual	Cassette-tape(25 minutes 1
UC - Los Angeles	Self-Guided Tour	anyone	individual	Printed tour-guide 2
UC - Santa Barbara	Tape Cassette Tour	anyone	individual	Cassette-tape 1
Dartmouth	Library Instruction	freshmen/anyone	individual	Tape 1
General Motors Institute	Library Orientation	anyone	individual	Printed materials 1

*For key to numbers see last page of charts

Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

IV. TOUR (continued)

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
U. of Houston	General Library Orient.	anyone	individual	Printed tour-guide 2
U. of Illinois (Chicago Circle)	Freshman Orientation Walking Tour	freshmen	individual	Printed tour-guide 2
U. of Illinois (Urbana)	Education Library Tours	education students & faculty	5-15 1st week	Bibliographies, etc. 6
No. Dakota State	Self-Guided Tour	anyone	individual	Cassette-tape 2
Western Michigan U.	Self-Guided Tour	freshmen/anyone	individual	Printed tour-guide 3

V. GENERAL ORIENTATION

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
Columbia U.	Reference Dept. Orient. Program	all students	8-10 Begin. semester	Actual indexes, card catalog, etc. 1
U. of Hawaii	Super-8 Cartridges	all students	individual	Sound-film cartridges (4-6 minutes) 1

*For key to numbers see last page of chart

V. GENERAL ORIENTATION (continued)

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
U. of Maryland	[no title]	all students	unknown	Library guide, printed materials, samples, bibliographies Guide-2 Rest-1

VI. REFERENCE CONSULTATION

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
Brown	Grad. Library Reference Assistant Program	undergraduates/faculty	individual	Subject guides 2
Indiana U.	Reference Raps	undergraduates	individual	Bibliographies 2
Columbia U.	Grad. Student Consultation Program	graduate students	individual	Bibliographies, etc. 1

VII. SEMINAR

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials
Douglass College	Summer Prep. Program (Disadvantaged Students)	in-coming students	10-40 Summer	Printed materials, audio-tutorial units

*For key to numbers see last page of charts

Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

VII. SEMINAR (continued)

Institution	Program Title	Target Group	Group Size & Time-of-year	Instructional Materials*
UC - Davis	Grad. Students' Night Course: Biomedical Inf. (5 sessions)	grad. students, veterinary med.	18 Begin. semester?	Bibliographies, etc. 1
UC - San Francisco	Library Seminar (1 Session)	grad. students, nursing	15 As requested	Bibliographies, etc. 1
Purdue U.	[Physics research] (2 sessions?)	grad. students, physics	35	Bibliographies, handbook 1
RPI	Library-Use Seminars (2 sessions)	freshmen/grad.students	12-15 Begin. year	Bibliographies, etc. 6
U. of Rochester	English Graduate Student Bibliographic Seminars	grad. students, English	5-10 Mid-semester	Bibliographies, etc., handbook in preparation 6
Stanford U. (Engin. Library)	"Short Course" (4 sessions)	all students, engineering	5-50	slides 3

*Key to numbers in instructional materials column.
Numbers refer to the availablity of materials to other librarians that are interested.
1=Not available; 2=Available free of charge; 3=Available for loan free of charge; 4=Available for rent, amount specified; 5=Available for purchase, amount specified; 6=Institution did not supply information on availability.

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS SUBMITTING QUESTIONNAIRES

Key: * Questionnaires contain more than 4 pages. (See Introduction for information on ordering questionnaire results.)

(8) Number in this form indicates the total number of pages in the completed questionnaire. The original form was only three pages long; thus, extra pages were added to complete the answers to questions or samples of printed instructional materials have been attached.

1,2 Numbers in this form indicate the review or reviews in which the institution's program(s) is reported.

+ Questionnaires from institutions marked thusly were received too late to be included in the reviews or were, for one reason or another, omitted from the reviews. However, they are available from the Chairman. The numbers that follow the names are the reports in which it would be appropriate to include them. (See Introduction for information on ordering questionnaire results.)

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS COMPLETING THE ACRL AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION QUESTIONNAIRE

January, 1973

1. +Adelphi University, 2
2. *Andrews University, (12), 2
3. *Aurora College, (8), 1
4. *Austin College, (7), 1
5. Bank Street College of Education, 2
6. Baylor University, 2
7. Beloit College, 1
8. Brigham Young University, 2, 3
9. *Brooklyn College, (5), 2
10. *Brown University, (30), 4
11. Butler University, 2
12. California State University, Long Beach, 2
13. California State University, Northridge, 1, 2, 3, 4
14. *California State University, San Diego, (6), 1
15. California State University, San Francisco, 1
16. *California State University, San Francisco, (24), 2
17. California State University, San Francisco (Biology), 3
18. California State University, San Jose, 1
19. *Carleton College, (11), 2
20. Case Western Reserve University, 1
21. *Catonsville Community College, (11), 2
22. *Cazenovia College, (20), 1, 2
23. *Centenary College for Women, (16), 2
24. +Central Michigan University, 1
25. Clarkson College of Technology, 2, 4
26. *College of Marin, (83), 1
27. *College of Marin, (13), 2
28. *College of St. Thomas, (15), 2
29. *College of the Redwoods, (8), 2
30. *Colorado State University, Fort Collins, (6), 3
31. *Columbia University (Orientation), (91), 2, 4
32. *Columbia University, (9), 2
33. *Columbia University (Graduate Students), (85), 4
34. Cornell University (Uris Undergraduate Library), 2
35. Dartmouth College, 4
36. David Lipscomb College, 4
37. *Doane College, (15), 2

    Douglass College, see Rutgers U. Douglass College
38. *Earlham College, (98), 3
39. *Earlham College, (23), 2
40. Eastern Michigan University, 2
41. *Findlay College (31), 2
42. Furman University, 4
43. General Motors Institute, 4
44. *Georgia Institute of Technology, (89), 1, 2
45. *Grambling, (120), 2
46. Grinnell College, 2, 3
47. +Hiram College, 3
48. *Indiana University, Fine Arts Library, Bloomington, (12), 1
49. Indiana University, Undergraduate Library, Bloomington, 4
50. *Iowa Wesleyan College, (33), 2
51. +*Jefferson Community College, (22), 1
52. *Jefferson Community College, (15), 2
53. Lincoln University, Pennsylvania, 2
54. *Lock Haven State College, (20), 2
55. *Lon Morris College, (22), 4
56. *Manhattanville College, (20), 2
57. Mankato State College, 3

58.+*Mansfield State College, (12), 2

59. Mansfield State College, 4

60. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology, (6), 3

61. Mercyhurst, 2

62. *Merritt College, (59), 1

63. *Miami University, Middletown, Ohio, (14), 2

64. Mills College, 1

65. Monroe Community College, 2

66. Mount Sinai School of Medicine, 2

67. *Nassau Community College, (46), 1

68. *Nassau Community College, (30), 2

69. New York City Community College, 2

70. *North Carolina State University, Raleigh, (12), 2

71. *North Dakota State University, (41), 2

72. *North Dakota State University, (14), 3

73. *North Dakota State University, 4

74. *Northeastern University, (15), 2

75. *Northern Illinois University, (25), 2

76. Ohio Northern University, 4

77. *Ohio State University (Undergraduate Library), (8), 2, 3

78. Ohio State University (Graduate Students), 2

79. Ohio State University (Pharmacy Library), 3

80. *Oregon State University, Corvallis, (21), 3

81. *Our Lady of the Lake College, (10), 2

82. *Pacific Union College, (31), 2, 4

83. +Pacific University, 3

84.+*Pensacola Jr. College, (5), 1, 3

85. +Philadelphia College of Art, 2

86. *Plymouth State College, (6), 3

87. Plymouth State College, 4

88. *Portland Community College, (45), 3

89. *Prince George's Community College, (7), 4

90. Providence College, 2

91. *Purdue University (Engineering), (50), 1

92. *Purdue University (Library employees), (64), 1

93. *Purdue University (Physics Library), (15), 4

94. Purdue University (Freshman), 4

95. *Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, (13), 3

96. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 4

97. Rochester Institute of Technology, 1

98. *Roosevelt University, (5), 2

99. *Rosary College, (7), 2

100. Rosemont College, 2

101. *Rutgers University - Douglass College, (6), 2

102. Rutgers University - Douglass College, 4

103. *S.U.N.Y. at Brockport, (22), 2

104. S.U.N.Y. at Buffalo, 3

105. *S.U.N.Y. at Oswego, (5), 2

106. S.U.N.Y. at Stony Brook, 2

107. *St. Joseph College, Connecticut, (7), 2

108. *Simon Fraser University, (18), 1, 2, 4

109. *Sir George Williams University, (62), 2

110. *Sonoma State College, (8), 1, 2

111. *Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, (10), 2

112. *Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, (21), 2

113. Stanford University, 1

114. Stanford University (Engineering Library), 4

115. State University College, Geneseo, NY, 2

116. *State University College, Oneonta, NY, (6), 2

117. Staten Island Community College, 1

118. Syracuse University. Utica College, 1

119. +Taylor University, 2

120.*+Tusculum College, (43), 2, 3

121. *University of Alaska, (103), 1, 3

122. *University of British Columbia, (21), 1

123. *University of California, Davis (Health Sciences Library), (8), 1

124. University of California, Davis (Health Sciences Library), 4

125. University of California, Irvine, 2

126. *University of California, Los Angeles, (13), 1, 3

127. *University of California, Los Angeles, (10), 4

128. *University of California, San Francisco, (5), 4

129. *University of California, Santa Barbara, 2

130. *University of California, Santa Barbara, (6), 4

131. *University of Connecticut, (49), 1

132. *University of Connecticut, (11), 3

133. University of Dallas, 2

134. *University of Denver, (31), 2

135. *University of Denver, (26), 3

136. *University of Guelph, (44), 2

137. University of Guelph, 3, 4

138. University of Hawaii, 4

139. *University of Houston (General Education), (15), 2

140. University of Houston (Science Division), 2

141. *University of Houston (Humanities Division), (15), 4

142. *University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, (5), 2

143. *Univeristy of Illinois, Chicago Circle, (32), 4

144. *University of Illinois, Urbana, (6), 4

145. *University of Maryland, (26), 4

146. University of Michigan, Undergraduate Library, 2

147. *University of Missouri, Columbia, (9), 4

148. *University of Nebraska, Lincoln, (12), 2

149. *University of Nebraska, Lincoln, (91), 3

150. University of Nebraska, Omaha, 2

151. *University of North Carolina, Greensboro, (32), 2

152. *University of North Carolina, Wilmington, (73), 2

153. University of Oregon, 1

154. *University of Rochester (Freshmen), (21), 4

155. University of Rochester (English graduate), 4

156. University of St. Thomas, 1

157. University of San Francisco, 2

158. *University of South Carolina, (51), 2

159. *University of South Florida, (8), 2

160. *University of Tennessee, (18), 1,2

161. *University of the Pacific, (24), 2

162. *University of Wisconsin, Marshfield-Wood County, (6), 1

163. *University of Wisconsin, Parkside, (16), 2

164. University of Wisconsin, Parkside, 4

Utica College see Syracuse University

165. Virginia Military Institute, 1

166. Wadhams Hall Seminary College, 1

167. *Washtenaw Community College, (5), 2, 3

168. *Wellesley College, (19), 4

169. *West Suburban Hospital School of Nursing, (15), 4

170. Western College, 1

171. *Western Michigan University, (27), 4

172. *Winthrop College, (53), 2

173. Wright State University, 2

174. *Yale University, (33), 4

Name _____

Address _____

_____

_____

Return to: Thomas Kirk
Box E-72
Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana
47374

1. Position _____ 2. Institutional affiliation

_____

3. Did you borrow any of the questionnaires which were used in these reviews?

____Yes ____No

4. How many? 1 2 3 4 5 more than 5

5. Did you purchase copies of any questionnaires? ____Yes ____No

6. How many? 1 2 3 4 5 more than 5

7. I am interested in each of the following (check as many as are appropriate):

___a. Orientation programs
___b. Library instruction courses for general college student
___c. Library instruction courses for majors (undergraduate or graduate), dealing with literature of the sicsipline
___d. Course-related instruction
___e. Self-instruction programs
___f. Audio-visual
___g. Point of use instruction
___h. Computer-assisted instruction

8. The questionnaire.

a. What questions on the questionnaire were unnecessary, in your opinion?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

b. What questions need improvement?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

c. How?

d. What questions should be added to the form?

9. The reviews.

a. Were they useful to you? ___Yes ___No

b. What information was lacking from the reviews that would have been useful to you?

Review 1:

Review 2:

Review 3:

Review 4:

c. Should a new set of reviews be prepared within the next 12 months? ____
next 2 years? ____ not for several years? ____

10. What information on bibliographic instruction programs would be most useful to you?